

**REMARKS**

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

In response to the Office Action dated October 5, 2007, claims 1, 6 and 8 have been amended. Claims 1-6 and 8 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

I. Claims 1, 6 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al. (USPN 6,243,070). However, as the Examiner discusses claims 1, 3-6 and 8 under this rejection, it is presumed that the Examiner intended claims 1, 3-6 and 8.

The Examiner admits that Hill does not disclose that the luminance level of the first pixel based on the changed arrangement pattern *is determined using a stored table indicating a correspondence between arrangement patterns of sub-pixels and luminance levels of sub-pixels arranged in a certain direction, which is one of the same as the predetermined direction and different from the predetermined direction.* Despite such lack of teaching of Hill et al., the Examiner takes official notice of the fact that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store the weights of Hill et al. into a table using indexes because storing values in table using indexes allows for faster access to the stored data.

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

While the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to store the weights of Hill et al. into a table using indexes, this is not recognized by Hill et al. In addition, exactly what the weights and indexes would be has not been explained by the Examiner. Without such weights and indexes, a person of ordinary skill in the art could not assemble a table that would provide

any use in Hill et al. Furthermore, the predetermined weighting that is applied in Hill et al. does not appear to be of the type that would require a table.

As disclosed at column 17, lines 21-28 and lines 36-45 of Hill et al.:

Weighting may be applied during the scan conversion operation. When weighting is applied, different size regions of the scaled image may be used to determine whether a particular pixel sub-component should be turned on or off or to a value in between (as in the case of gray scaling). Application of weighting in this manner represents an anti-aliasing filtering operation which is performed in the direction perpendicular to the direction of the RGB striping.

...

In accordance with one embodiment of the present invention, *weighting is used during scan conversion so that 60% of the scaled image area that is mapped into a pixel is used to determine the luminous intensity of the green pixel sub-component, a separate 30% of the scaled image area that is mapped into the same pixel is used to determine the luminous intensity of the red pixel sub-component, and a separate 10% of the scaled image area that is mapped into the same pixel is used to determine the luminous intensity of the blue pixel sub-component.*

Given the use for weighting that is disclosed in Hill et al., the Examiner must show specifically how a table would be constructed and how this would provide the use for weighting that Hill et al. discloses, taking into consideration whether mere multiplication, using predetermined weighting, would provide a faster and simpler result.

Nevertheless, Applicant requests that the Examiner cite a reference showing a table of weights with indexes that could be used to achieve the same purpose of weighting as disclosed in Hill et al., and then explain how and why a person of ordinary skill in the art would be impelled to use such table in Hill et al. (see MPEP § 2144.03 A.).

At any rate, to expedite prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

the luminance level of the first pixel based on the changed arrangement pattern is determined using a stored table indicating a *predetermined*

correspondence between arrangement patterns of sub-pixels and luminance levels of sub-pixels arranged in a certain direction, which is one of the same as the predetermined direction and different from the predetermined direction, ***and the correspondence indicated by the stored table is determined using a predetermined correction pattern of color element levels of sub-pixels neighboring a sub-pixel corresponding to the basic portion.***

Independent claims 6 and 8 have been similarly amended.

This subject matter is based upon the disclosure at, for example, page 42, lines 3-20 of the present application

Hill et al. does not disclose or suggest that the correspondence indicated by the stored table is determined using a predetermined correction pattern (see Fig. 10 of the present application) of color element levels of sub-pixels neighboring a sub-pixel corresponding to the basic portion. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 8, as amended, are patentable over Hill et al.

**II.** Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of Desai (USPN 6,282,328).

However, claim 2 depends directly from amended independent claim 1 and Desai does not remedy the above-noted deficiency of Hill et al. with respect to amended independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over Hill, even when considered in view of Desai.

**III.** In view of the above, the allowance of claims 1-6 and 8, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise Reg. No. 34,523 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Date: January 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata  
Registration No.: 39,491  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH,  
LLP 8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant